

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/813,979	-	03/29/2004	Thomas E. Kovanko	SC-5357	5911		
24275	7590	03/30/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
James V.	Lapacek			VELEZ, R	VELEZ, ROBERTO		
S & C Elec 6601 N. Ri				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Chicago, I				2829			
				DATE MAIL ED: 03/30/2004	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u> </u>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/813,979	KOVANKO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Roberto Velez	2829					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address -	-				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONin atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. apply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communica ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29							
,	·						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	d/or election requirement						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 March 2004</u> is/ar							
Applicant may not request that any objection to							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority docum							
Copies of the certified copies of the p		received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bu	•						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.					
Attachment(s)	»□····	Nummon (DTO 442)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	Paper No(s	Gummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/06/2006.		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/813,979

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/06/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant respectfully submits (Page 3, Lines 15-16) that there is no teaching of applicants' invention as recited in claim 1 for an optical current sensor that includes both DC magnetic bias and mechanical prestress bias to a modulator for linearizing the output thereof.

Examiner disagrees to Applicant's arguments. Adolfsson et al. (US Pat. 4,547,729) shows (Fig. 6) an optical current sensor that includes a DC magnetic bias [59] and mechanical prestress bias [56] to modulator [5]. Adolfsson et al. is silent about linearizing the output. However, Adolfsson et al. discloses (Column 1, Lines 16-40) overcoming the problem of non-linear drawbacks with his invention. Adolfsson et al. discloses (Column 1, Lines 37-40) an example where he states that is possible to obtain measurements of very great exactness and which are independent of instabilities (referring inherently to the linearization problem) and ageing phenomena in the light conductors, for example.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/813,979 Page 3

Art Unit: 2829

3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Adolfsson et al. (US Pat. 4,547,729).

Regarding claim 1, *Adolfsson et al.* shows (Fig. 6) an optical fiber current measuring device comprises: a modulator [5] having magneto-strictive properties; a first means [4] affixed to said modulator [5] for providing an output proportional to the current in the conductor [61]; and second means [59] for coupling the magnetic field generated by the current in the conductor [61] to said modulator [5] and linearizing (with high accuracy as stated in Column 4, Lines 17-18) the output to said first means [4] by providing both DC magnetic bias (using [59]) and mechanical prestress bias (with the bending of [56]) to said modulator [5].

Regarding claim 3, *Adolfsson et al.* shows (Fig. 6) second means [59] defines a magnetic path and includes a permanent magnet [59] arranged in said magnetic path.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adolfsson et al. (US Pat. 4,547,729) in view of Goldner et al. (US Pat. 6,211,982).

Regarding claim 2, Adolfsson et al. discloses everything as claimed above in claim 1.

Adolfsson et al. fails to disclose said first means includes two or more tunable fiber optical filters and the output of said first means is formed by contribution from each of said tunable fiber optical filters. However, Goldner et al. shows (Fig. 1) a remote sensor with waveguide optics telemetry comprises said first means [30, 28, 41] includes two or more tunable fiber optical filters and the output of said first means [30, 28, 41] is formed by contribution from each of said tunable fiber optical filters.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of *Goldner et al.* into the device of *Adolfsson et al.* by having two or more tunable fiber optical filters and the output of said first means is formed by contribution from each of said tunable fiber optical filters. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify *Adolfsson et al.* in the manner set forth above for the purpose of reflecting a bigger quantity of the signal as an output in a faster way.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/813,979 Page 5

Art Unit: 2829

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Velez whose telephone number is 571-272-8597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/813,979 Page 6

Art Unit: 2829

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberto Velez
Patent Examiner

PARESH PATEL 03)29/06